

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application Number	: 10/064,221	Confirmation No.:	4472
Applicant	: Lawrence Miller et al.		
Filed	: June 21, 2002		
Title	: Method and System for Determining Receipt of a Delayed Cookie in a Client-Server Architecture		
TC/Art Unit	: 2145		
Examiner:	: Jeffrey R. Swearingen		
Docket No.	: 72167.000582		
Customer No.	: <b>21967</b>		

**MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

The Examiner provided a Statement of Reasons for Allowance on pages 2-4 of the Notice of Allowability presented with the Notice of Allowance. Applicants agree that the cited art teachings fail to teach or suggest -- alone or in combination -- each and every element of the claimed systems and methods. In addition, Applicants agree that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the features listed on pages 2-3, but respectfully submits that there are other elements of the allowed claims that are also not taught or suggested by the prior art. Applicants further appreciate the Examiner setting forth an exemplary utility of the claimed systems and methods, but respectfully submits that the claimed systems and methods have utility in numerous other contexts and operations.

The Examiner states that "Applicant defined a slow cookie as a GET ACCESS cookie." Applicants submit that the claims do not support such a limiting definition. The Examiner's importation of additional limitations from the specification is improper and contrary to giving each claim term its broadest and reasonable meaning. As defined in the claims, "the slow cookie

is not immediately available for transmission to the client.” A GET ACCESS cookie is merely one type of slow cookie. Other types of cookies, tokens or elements may qualify as a “slow cookie” pursuant to the claim language.

The Examiner states that “Applicant presented this method and system as being present only in a two-tier authentication system.” Applicants respectfully disagree. The claims use the term “comprising” which is an open ended term. Moreover, the claims do not specifically recite “a two-tier authentication system” and should not be so limited.

The Examiner states that the system and method are limited to “those servers which create GET ACCESS cookies.” Applicants respectfully disagree. Again, the claims do not recite “servers which create slow cookies” or “servers which create GET ACCESS cookies” and therefore should be not limited in this manner.

Applicants do not believe that any fees are required for this submission. If any additional fees are deemed necessary, Applicants hereby provide authorization to charge such fees against deposit account 50-0206. If any refunds are due, Applicants hereby provide authorization to credit such refunds against the deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Date: November 20, 2008

By:



Yisun Song  
Registration No. 44,487

Hunton & Williams LLP  
Intellectual Property Department  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006-1109  
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)  
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)